

**REMARKS**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416.

The amendment of claim 1 serves to add clarification and is not in response to the double patenting rejection.

The amendment of claim 10 serves to broaden the scope of claim 10 and is not in response to the double patenting rejection.

The addition of new claims 11-16 is not in response to the double patenting rejection.

Claim 11 is the same claim as the originally submitted claim 10.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections with the following arguments.

**Double Patenting**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416.

**Claims 1-9**

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 1 is not unpatentable over claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416, because claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

As a first example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the semiconductor film at the first location will become part of at least one of the plurality of devices, wherein the semiconductor film at the second location will become part of at least one other device of the plurality of devices".

As a second example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the first and second compositions are different and are expected to create differences in at least one of the plurality of device characteristics between devices created at the first location and devices created at the second location".

As a third example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "performing a plurality of semiconductor processing steps on the semiconductor film to create the plurality of devices".

10/707,937

9

Applicants note that claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 are totally silent about a "plurality of devices" and about "device characteristics".

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 1 is not unpatentable over claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 1-9 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 1-9 are likewise not unpatentable over claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 and are in condition for allowance.

#### Claim 10

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 10 is not unpatentable over claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416, because claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10.

As a first example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "providing a platen able to be spun about an axis".

As a second example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "a semiconductor wafer on a top surface of the platen, the semiconductor wafer having a top surface".

As a third example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "at least one nozzle and at least one vapor source per nozzle".

10/707,937

10

As a fourth example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "the at least one nozzle over a first location, at a first radius, on the semiconductor wafer".

As a fifth example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "a transport vapor through the at least one nozzle".

As a sixth example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "a vapor species from the vapor source with the transport vapor".

As a seventh example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "the vapor species and transport vapor onto the top surface of the semiconductor wafer".

As a eighth example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "controlling the dwell time over the first location of the at least one nozzle, thereby depositing at the first location the semiconductor film having a first thickness, the semiconductor film at the first location comprising a first composition that comprises the vapor species".

As a ninth example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or

suggest the feature: "the at least one nozzle over a second location, at a second radius, on the semiconductor wafer".

As a tenth example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "controlling the dwell time over the second location of the at least one nozzle, thereby depositing at the second location the semiconductor film having a second thickness".

As an eleventh example why claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 do not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the semiconductor film at the second location comprises a second composition that comprises the vapor species".

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 10 is not unpatentable over claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416, and that claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Since new claims 11-16 depend from claim 10, Applicants contend that new claims 11-16 are likewise not unpatentable over claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6,344,416 and are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0456.

Date: 12/30/2004

Jack P. Friedman  
Jack P. Friedman  
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts  
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201  
Latham, New York 12110  
(518) 220-1850

10/707,937

13